



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,934	09/13/2005	Thomas Deck	40124/05001	3644
30636	7590	12/20/2007	EXAMINER	
FAY KAPLUN & MARCIN, LLP			DANG, HUNG Q	
150 BROADWAY, SUITE 702			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10038			2612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/20/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,934	DECK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hung Q. Dang	2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 47-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 47-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 May 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to application's amendment dated 9/17/2007. The amendment of claims 47 and the cancellation of claims 1-46 have been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Regarding claim 47**, based on the amended claim 47, the applicant argues that the Bennet reference does teach signal processing, after digitization by the A/D converter, before it is transmitted.

The examiner disagrees with the applicant. Even though, paragraph [0031] of the Bennet reference mentions about "...the digitized signal is processed...", however, it implies nothing more than just signal modulation so that signal transmission can be carried out. Signal modulation is not typically considered as signal processing. Therefore, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a

whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 47-51, 53-56, 58 and 60-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett JR et al. U.S. 2001/0028305.

**Regarding claims 47, 65 and 66,** Bennett JR et al. teaches a sensor unit, comprising:

A measured signal receiver (figure 3, units 60 and 60');  
an A/D converter (Figure 3, unit 64) digitizing a measured signal;  
a transceiver device (Figure 3, unit 24) wirelessly transmitting data to an environmental device; and  
a processor (Figure 3, unit 68) activating the measured signal receiver, the A/D converter, and the transceiver device, the processor digitizing the measured signal and subsequently transmitting without signal processing after the A/D conversion, via the transceiver device, to the environmental device (Figure 1, unit 28), the environmental device being coupled to an analysis unit (Figure 1, unit 30) which converts the measured signal into a measured value (paragraph [0022]). (Also, see the above response to argument for explanation of the claimed limitation "...without signal processing");

Even though, Bennett JR et al. does not specifically discloses a measured signal receiver registering (or recording) a measured signal, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a measured signal receiver for registering or recording a measured signal to the sensor

unit disclosed by Bennett et al. so that measured data can be recorded and stored up for possible future re-transmission.

**Regarding claim 48**, the input/output components claimed in claim 48 are inherent based on the rejection of claim 47 stated above (see figure 3).

**Regarding claim 49**, the sensor unit disclosed by Bennett JR et al. is also a fill level sensor (paragraph [0022]).

**Regarding claims 54-55 and 60**, Bennett JR et al. teaches coupling the environmental device (Figure 1, unit 28) with a process control system (Figure 1, unit 30; and paragraph [0023]), without specifically indicating wire or wireless coupling.

The examiner takes official notice that wire/wireless coupling/connecting two devices have been commonly known and equipped in many communication systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide wire or wireless coupling or connection between the environmental device and the process control system disclosed by Bennett JR et al.

**Regarding claims 58, 62 and 64**, even though, Bennett JR et al. only disclose one environmental device including a control and a display unit (see paragraph [0022]), however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further provide another environmental device so that the sensed data can be transmitted to another location/user for data processing.

**Regarding claims 53, 56 and 61**, the examiner takes official notice that bidirectional communication between any two devices has been conventionally equipped in many control/communication systems for data transmission or control

operations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide bidirectional communications between any of the two devices disclosed by Bennett JR et al.

**Claim 63** is rejected for the same reasons as the rejection of claim 52.

**Claims 67 and 69** are rejected for similar reasons as the rejection of claim 47.

Even though, Bennett JR et al. does not specifically disclose a plurality of sensor units, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a plurality of sensor units (similar as the one claimed in claim 47) to the system disclosed by Bennett JR et al. so that a plurality of different parameters can be sensed and transmitted to a remote location for processing.

**Claim 68** is rejected for the same reasons as the rejection of claim 58.

**Regarding claims 50-51**, the examiner takes official notice that such claimed signals have been commonly known and applied in monitoring systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide receiving any of the claimed signal depending on the desired application.

5. Claims 52, 57 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett JR et al. U.S. 2001/0028305 in view of Soliman U.S. Pub 2003/0174067.

**Regarding claim 52**, Bennett JR et al. teaches the sensor unit of claim 47. However, Bennett JR et al. does not specifically teach the wireless transmission of the data between the sensor unit and the environmental device using WLAN.

Soliman, in the same field of endeavor, discloses a wireless telemetry network, wherein a WLAN is employed between device-device transmission.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide WLAN for wireless transmission between the sensor unit and the environmental device disclosed by Bennett JR et al., as evidenced by Soliman, so that sensed data can be wirelessly transmitted to said environmental device.

**Regarding claims 57 and 59**, Bennett JR et al. teaches the sensor unit of claim 58. However, Bennett JR et al. does not teach said environmental device being a mobile device.

Soliman, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a wireless environmental telemetry network, wherein the environmental device is a mobile device (Figure 1, unit 140) so that said mobile device can be carried around.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the environmental device disclosed by Bennett JR et al. to be a mobile device, as evidenced by Soliman, so that said environmental device can be carried around by the operator.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Q. Dang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3069. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman can be reached on (571) 272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hung Q Dang  
12/10/2007  
H.D.



BRIAN ZIMMERMAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER